



## EPA Puget Sound Financial and Ecosystem Accounting Tracking System (FEATS)

Photo by Rebecca Pirtle, Editor, Kingston Community News (Doe-Kag-Wats Estuary of the Suquamish Tribe)

### PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>1. Federal Grant Number</b>	PA-00J322-01	<b>*2a. Reporting Period Start Date:</b>	4/1/2014	<b>*2b. Reporting Period End Date:</b>	9/30/2014
<b>3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including zip code)</b> Name: Northwest Indian Fisheries Commissi Address 1: 6730 Martin Way East Address 2: City: Olympia State: WA Zip Code: 98516-5540			<b>4. Project Manager Contact Information</b> Name: Terry Wright Phone: (360) 528-4336 Ext: Fax: ( ) - Email: wright@nwifc.org		
<b>5a. Program (RFP)</b>  <b>Tribal Lead Org</b>	<b>5b. Project Title</b>  Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission Lead Organization Award		<b>*6. Collaborating Organizations/Partners</b>  None  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Subawardee</b> 21 Tribes/Tribal Consortiums		

<b>Submission Instructions:</b> EPA fills in the white boxes. Grantee fills in the yellow boxes (boxes with asterisks). Refer to guidance document for how to fill out the boxes.  After completing the form, save and e-mail it to the Project Officer and cc: the Technical Monitor.	<b>Project Officer:</b> Lisa Chang <b>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</b> <b>Email:</b> chang.lisa@epa.gov  <b>Technical Monitor:</b> <b>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</b> <b>Email:</b>	<b>*7a. Name/Title of Person Submitting Report</b>	Tiffany Waters PS Recovery Proj. Coordinator
		<b>*7b. Date Report Submitted</b>	10/27/2014

## FUNDING/COST ANALYSIS

8a. Total EPA Assistance Amount Awarded:	\$15,700,581.46	8b. Funding Year (Federal Fiscal Year Funds Appropriated)	FY 2010 FY 2011 FY 2012 FY 2013	*9. Total EPA Amount Expended To-Date:	\$9,977,061.42	*10. Funds Drawn Down from EPA To-Date:	\$10,145,994.00
11. Match Amount Required	\$0.00	*12. Total Match Amount Expended and Documented To-Date:	\$0.00	*13. Have you experienced any cost overruns or high unit costs?	No		
*14. What issues or questions do you need the EPA Project Officer or Technical Monitor to respond to?		None					

## BUDGET UPDATE

	15a. APPROVED BUDGET			*15b. SPENT TO-DATE		
	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL
Personnel	\$216,721.00	\$0.00	\$216,721.00	\$195,329.11	\$0.00	\$195,329.11
Fringe Benefits	\$68,620.27	\$0.00	\$68,620.27	\$61,484.52	\$0.00	\$61,484.52
Travel	\$8,797.25	\$0.00	\$8,797.25	\$10,389.25	\$0.00	\$10,389.25
Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ 0.00		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Supplies	\$6,468.18	\$0.00	\$6,468.18	\$4,566.10	\$0.00	\$4,566.10
Contracts	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Other	\$3,489,099.97	\$0.00	\$3,489,099.97	\$9,585,291.48	\$0.00	\$9,585,291.48
TOTAL DIRECT CHARGES	\$15,544,868.69	\$0.00	\$15,544,868.69		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Indirect Charges	\$155,712.77	\$0.00	\$155,712.77	\$120,000.96	\$0.00	\$120,000.96
TOTAL	\$15,700,581.46	\$0.00	\$15,700,581.46	\$9,977,061.42	\$0.00	\$9,977,061.42
*Explain Any Discrepancies:	The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission operates on a reimbursement basis with our member tribes.					

## ECOSYSTEM GOALS ADDRESSED

16a. Primary Goal	Healthy Habitat
16b. Additional Goals	Healthy Species    Water Quality    Water Quantity    -----    -----    -----

## DIRECT THREATS ADDRESSED

17a. Primary Threat	-----
17b. Secondary Threat(s)	Climate Change    Dams/Levees/Tidegates    Derelict Gear/Vessels    Development    Invasive Species - Terrestrial Invasive Species - Marine
	Large Scale Timber Harvest    Shoreline Armoring    Surface Water Loading/Runoff from the Built Env    -----

## LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND ACTION AGENDA

18a. Strategic Priorities Employed	Priority A    Priority B    Priority C    Priority D    Priority E
18b. Near-Term Actions Supported	D.3 NTA 3
18c. Other Actions Supported	

## LINKAGES TO EPA PUGET SOUND MEASURES

19. Measure(s)	Habitat Restored/Protected    -----    -----
----------------	--

## LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND DASHBOARD INDICATORS

20a. Primary Indicator	-----
20b. Additional Indicators	Marine Water Quality Index    Stream Flows Below Critical Levels    Wild Chinook Salmon    Pacific Herring Shoreline Armoring

## PROJECT LOCATION

21a. Latitude	47.051698	21b. Longitude	-122.792501
21c. Hydrologic Unit Code	171100 - Sound-wide	-----	-----
21d. Action Area	Sound-wide	-----	-----

## MEASURES OF SUCCESS (Key Grant Outputs)

*22a. Description (e.g., "shellfish beds reopened")	*22b. Unit (e.g., "acres")	*22c. Project Target ("number")	*22d. Project Measure To-Date ("number")
Developed and distributed a final RFP to 21 Tribes and Tribal Consortiums for each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15)	RFP Document	4	4
Developed and engaged in a Coordination Plan, disseminating and sharing a subrecipient project information document each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15) with tribes and LO group	Subrecipient Proposal Information	4	4
Approved 21 subrecipient proposals, communicated award notification, and executed contracts to all subrecipients for each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15)	Subrecipient Contracts in Place	84	83
Closed-out 21 subrecipient workplans with deliverables received and posted online to PSP/NWIFC website for each fiscal year (FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15)	Subrecipient Contracts Closed-out	84	18

## PROJECT MILESTONES

**Instructions:** In the tables below, please explain your progress toward meeting agreed outputs for the period, **reasons for slippages**, and any additional information including **reflections, lessons learned, and/or thoughtful analysis**. When appropriate, include analysis and information of **cost overruns or high unit costs**, and changes to work plan or budget not requiring prior approval from EPA. We encourage photo documentation - please attach to the report as a separate document.

**23a. Work Plan Component/Task:** 1. Program development and launch

**23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:** D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.

**\*23c. Estimated Costs:**

**Actual Costs to Date:**

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
1.1	Communication/outreach plan	1.14.11, 7.12.11, 6.22.12, 6.17.13	COMPLETED	Communication/outreach plan	NWIFC developed a communication/outreach plan for FY10, FY11, FY12, and FY13 that consisted of: (1) a transmittal note for the RFP; (2) a mailing

					<p>distribution list that ensured that all eligible entities were notified equitably, timely, and thoroughly; and (3) a target date for releasing the RFP.</p> <p>Due to our previous interactions and current relationships with our member tribes, we had in place a Puget Sound Tribes distribution list that contained pertinent tribal contacts. We vetted this distribution list to ensure that the proper contacts are included and have continued to add to this distribution list as needed and requested.</p>
1.2	RFP development and distribution	1.25.11, 7.15.11, 6.22.12, 8.5.13	COMPLETED	Final RFP distributed	<p>NWIFC developed the final FY10 RFP through close consultation with the EPA, utilizing and editing the FY08 RFP to finalize the FY10's fundamental components and timeline. Additions to the FY10 RFP included: (1) language that fully described the intent of these funds; (2) requirements for all projects that collect environmental data to have a QAPP in place prior to data collection; and (3) logic model terminology. While we didn't include the traditional logic model table format, we utilized the logic model terminology to request specific outputs and outcomes per task.</p> <p>The FY10 RFP was then used as a template to develop subsequent fiscal year RFPs.</p> <p>Additions to the FY11 RFP included: (1) adding PSP Ecosystem Recovery Targets as eligible activities under this</p>

				<p>award; (2) a request to describe how the potential impacts of climate change will be addressed in the planning and implementation of the subrecipient project; and (3) additional guidance regarding the information needed in the budget narrative, including a task delineated budget appendix. In consultation with the EPA Project Officer, we finalized the proposal review process and timeline.</p> <p>Additions to the FY12 RFP of note included: (1) clarifying language that delineated differences between subcontracts and professional services within the budget narrative section; and (2) adding a category within the narrative section that required an explanation of how technical review was going to occur for major technical products of the subrecipient workplan. This provision on technical review was included to reflect and satisfy a new term and condition of NWIFC's contract that NWIFC and the EPA project officer collaboratively discussed and agreed upon.</p> <p>Additions to the FY13 RFP of note included: (1) notification and inclusion of a new riparian buffer on agricultural lands term and condition; and (2) a request for distinction between outputs that are tracked to monitor the progress of an award versus deliverables that are work products that will be provided to</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>NWIFC before the close of the award.</p> <p>We distributed the final RFP for FY10 on 1.25.11, for FY11 on 7.15.11, for FY12 on 6.22.12, and for FY13 on 8.5.13.</p>
1.3	Coordination plan	1.31.11	COMPLETED	Coordination plan	<p>NWIFC developed a coordination plan that can be executed throughout the project period and includes: (1) ensuring that the PSP is aware of the aims and activities of the subrecipient projects by enlisting them as a key reviewer of these subawards; (2) engaging the EPA Project Officer to discuss the capacity awards that the subrecipient projects are concurrently receiving, in order to avoid duplicative funding efforts; (3) engaging in existing processes and groups to disseminate and share subrecipient project information, including the ECB, the Leadership Council, the PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and the PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus; (4) participating in LO meetings to ensure that other LOs are fully award of our subrecipient projects and vise versa; (5) an existing NWIFC website that is dedicated to information related to Puget Sound Partnership and Treaty Tribes of Western Washington.</p>
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

**23a. Work Plan Component/Task:** 2. Award cycle

**23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:** D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.

**\*23c. Estimated Costs:**  
**Actual Costs to Date:**  
**(If required by PO)**

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
2.1	Reviewing subaward proposals	7.6.11, 3.21.11, 1.9.14, 6.27.14	COMPLETED	Project files set up; comments from all reviewers documented; input shared with applicants	All project files have been set up, with all digital files held by the Projects Coordinator and all final hard copies held by the Contracts Specialist.  For FY10, FY11, FY12, and FY13 NIWFC has received, documented, and shared input from the NWIFC, EPA, and PSP review teams with all 21 subrecipients.
2.2	Receive final proposals and make subawards	8.2.11, 7.12.12, 4.15.14, ongoing	CURRENT	Final workplans addressing key input received; 65% of funds awarded by 11/16/12; 100% by 1/1/13; all recipients informed of award requirements	For FY10, FY11, and FY12 NWIFC has successfully communicated with all 21 subrecipients to address key input and all final workplans have been received, approved, and awarded. For FY13, NWIFC has successfully communicated with 20 subrecipients to address key input and final workplans for these subrecipients have been received, approved, and awarded. There is one subrecipient workplan that has not been approved yet as the tribe has not provided a final workplan addressing key reviewer comments. It is anticipated that this tribe will provide this final workplan in the month of October.  For FY10, 65% of funds were



					<p>awarded by 5/19/2011 and 100% of funds were awarded by 8.2.11. For FY11, 65% of funds were awarded by 2.9.12 and 100% of funds were awarded by 7/12/12. For FY12, 65% of funds were awarded by 3.26.13 and 95% of funds were awarded by 9.25.13. For FY13, 62% of funds were awarded by 3/6/2014 and it is anticipated that 100% of funds will be awarded in October, 2014.</p> <p>All contracted subrecipients have been informed of award requirements, as included in their NWIFC contract (including EPA Administrative and Programmatic Conditions; Anti-lobbying Certification; MBE/WBE Certification; Federal Financial Report; EPA FEATS; OMB Circulars A-87, A-133 &amp; A-102; 15 CFR Part 24 &amp; Part 28; 2 CFR Part 1326, Subpart C; and 40 CFR Part 34).</p>
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

<b>23a. Work Plan Component/Task:</b> 3. Program management					
<b>23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:</b> D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.					
<b>*23c. Estimated Costs:</b> <b>Actual Costs to Date:</b> <b>(If required by PO)</b>					
<b>23d. Sub-Task No.</b>	<b>23e. Sub-Task Description</b>	<b>*23f. Date</b>	<b>*23g. Status</b>	<b>23h. Outputs/Deliverables</b>	<b>*23i. Remarks</b>

3.1	Support/meet with awardees	Ongoing	CURRENT	All subrecipients understand applicable award requirements	All subrecipients have been contacted via phone, email, or in person and the appropriate support has continued to be given in regards to the award process and applicable award requirements. The Projects Coordinator retains and files all email correspondence and maintains a phone log tracking all substantive phone conversations.
3.2	Conduct project monitoring	Ongoing	CURRENT	Subawardee reporting requirements met; site visits conducted to 33% of funded projects (year 1); site visit and progress reports prepared and made available; all recipients in compliance with applicable award requirements	For the reporting periods of 4.1.11 - 9.30.11, 10.1.11 - 3.31.12, 4.1.12 - 9.30.12, 10.1.12 - 3.31.13, 4.1.13 - 9.30.13, and 10.1.13 - 3.31.14, FY10, FY11, FY12 and any applicable FY13 subreipients submitted FEATS progress reports to the Projects Coordinator. The Projects Coordinator reviews FEATS for progress to ensure that all subrecipients are in compliance with applicable award requirements, including but not limited to: proper budget invoicing, project timeline adherence, task and output progress (including project requirements such as QAPP and permit approval), draw-down rate versus expenditures. For any FY12 or FY13 projects that were not yet contracted or had not yet begun (neither tasks nor funding begun/expended), the Projects Coordinator communicated with the subreipient that a FEATS was not needed and marked within the tracking sheet which projects had not yet begun.  When necessary, the Projects Coordinator communicated with

				<p>subrecipients to clarify information provided in the FEATS report and ascertain additional project progress. All approved subrecipient FEATS were sent to the Contracts Specialist for final review and approval and were posted online to the PSP/NWIFC website.</p> <p>In anticipation of the next subrecipient reporting due on 10.31.14, the Projects Coordinator edited applicable FY10, FY11, and FY12 FEATS to reflect budget modifications and contract amendments and pre-populated applicable FY13 FEATS. The Projects Coordinator emailed each subrecipient project coordinator their FEATS report at the beginning of October providing a reminder and pre-populated FEATS approximately 30 days prior to their report deadline. Upon receiving FEATS reports on 10.31.14, the Projects Coordinator will engage in review and approval of all applicable FY10, FY11, FY12 and FY13 subrecipient FEATS reports.</p> <p>Seven sites visits are scheduled to occur each year. For the first year, seven sites visits were conducted at: Makah Nation, Samish Indian Nation, Nisqually Indian Tribe, Suquamish Tribe, Upper Skagit Indian Tribe, Swinomish Indian Tribe, and Nooksack Indian Tribe. For the second year, seven site visits were conducted at: Tulalip Tribes, Squaxin Island Tribe, Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe, Lower Elwha</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Klallam Tribe, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, and Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. For the third year, two site visits have occurred at Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe and Makah Nation, with a third scheduled in October for Puyallup Tribe of Indians. The Projects Coordinator plans to conduct an additional four site visits in the fall of 2014 / winter 2015.</p> <p>Site visits are determined using a risk evaluation matrix and conducted to assess project progress and compliance with award requirements (including, but not limited to - adherence to workplan timeline; progress and completion of tasks and outputs; QAPP development, review, and/or approval status; desire/need for an EPA TSR; obstacles or problems encountered by subrecipient; progress report requirement adherence; review of funds spent and/or high award balances, if applicable; and subrecipient questions regarding award conditions, including proposal, review, and reporting requirements).</p> <p>All site visit reports are held at NWIFC and are available upon request.</p>
3.3	Execute coordination plan	4.1.11, 1.10.12, 1.17.13, 3.31.14	CURRENT	Exchange of project lists between LOs; Update of the PSP/NWIFC website to include subaward project descriptions and progress reports, as	NWIFC continued to: (1) engage the PSP as a key reviewer of these subawards; (2) meet with the EPA Project Officer to discuss relevant capacity awards of the subrecipients to ensure funding duplication did not occur; (3)

				<p>they become available; Other coordination activities to be developed in consultation with EPA PO</p>	<p>participate in ECB, Leadership Council, PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus meetings, as possible given the departure of the Puget Sound Policy Analyst; (4) participate in scheduled LO meetings and disseminate a list of subrecipient projects for FY10, FY11, FY12, and FY13 (list provided at the LO Listening Session meeting held on 3/31/14); and (5) update the PSP/NWIFC website to include meeting notes for ECB, Leadership Council, PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus meetings.</p> <p>The Projects Coordinator recently updated the FY10, FY11, FY12, and FY13 subrecipient project lists and PSP/NWIFC tribal project webpages to incorporate any significant scope and project changes.</p>
3.4	Reporting and adaptive management	<p>11.30.11, 4.20.12, 10.31.12, 4.30.13, 10.31.13, 4.23.14, 10.31.14</p>	CURRENT	<p>LO reporting requirements fulfilled; quarterly check-in meetings/calls with EPA PO</p>	<p>Administration of the program, including periodic progress review, has been coordinated by the Projects Coordinator, under the tutelage of the Salmon Recovery Projects Coordinator. NWIFC continues to be in close contact with NWIFC's EPA Project Officer, engaging in regular check-ins to clarify EPA proposal reviews and discuss challenges faced within the review process. The EPA Projects Officer continues to be extremely helpful, proactive, and communicative during the entirety of this award process.</p> <p>The LO reporting requirements</p>

					were successfully met for the reporting periods of 4.1.11 - 9.30.11, 10.1.1 - 3.31.12, 4.1.12 - 9.30.12, 10.1.12 - 3.31.13, 4.1.13 - 9.30.13, and 10.1.13 - 3.31.14. The LO reporting requirements are in the process of being fulfilled for the 4.1.14 - 10.31.14 reporting period (as being submitted through this FEATS report).
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

<b><u>23a. Work Plan Component/Task:</u></b>					
<b><u>23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:</u></b>					
<b><u>*23c. Estimated Costs:</u></b>					
<b><u>Actual Costs to Date:</u></b>					
<b><u>(If required by PO)</u></b>					
<b>23d. Sub-Task No.</b>	<b>23e. Sub-Task Description</b>	<b>*23f. Date</b>	<b>*23g. Status</b>	<b>23h. Outputs/Deliverables</b>	<b>*23i. Remarks</b>
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

<b><u>23a. Work Plan Component/Task:</u></b>					
<b><u>23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:</u></b>					

<b>*23c. Estimated Costs:</b> <b>Actual Costs to Date:</b> <b>(If required by PO)</b>					
23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		
			-----		

## CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS (specific to reporting period)

*24a. Task No., Sub-Task No.	*24b. Challenge	*24c. Solution
Financial Reporting	The Commission has received a second cooperative agreement for the FY14/Round 5 and FY15/Round 6 funding for Tribal implementation projects. There was a question as to how to properly report progress and financial draw-downs with these two contracts.	After discussion with the EPA Project Officer, it was determined that the Commission will be submitting two FEATS reports, one for each contract, and will be reporting on the FY10-FY13 administrative and subaward progress through this FEATS and the FY14-15 administrative and subaward progress in a separate FEATS. However, it should be noted that the administrative (non subaward) charges are still being charged to the FY10-FY13 contract and are being reported in the above budget summary.

## HIGHLIGHTS/LESSONS LEARNED/REFLECTIONS

<b>*25.</b> (1) HIGHLIGHT: While all 21 subrecipient tribes are advancing projects that will and are substantially contributing to the restoration and protection of Puget Sound, we have chosen to highlight the progress of the following subrecipient projects. Additional tribal project accomplishments are in the process of being reported to NWIFC for this reporting period. Once NWIFC has reviewed and approved the next subrecipient FEATS reports, due to NWIFC on 10/31/14, they will be posted online to the PSP/NWIFC website ( <a href="http://blogs.nwifc.org/psp/">http://blogs.nwifc.org/psp/</a> ).
---

The Point No Point Treaty Council (PNPTC) has continued to engage in its ongoing Indian Island Baitfish Monitoring Project to develop a standardized sampling protocol to establish annual indices of surf smelt and Pacific sand lance spawning success. PNPTC and its member tribes are particularly concerned with the role of forage fish in the food web due to the importance of these fish as prey to salmonid species that are a key part of Northwest tribal cultural heritage and are integral to tribal treaty fishing rights. The methods developed during the first two years of this study show a capacity for providing quantitative indices of surf smelt and Pacific sand lance spawn deposition; and results indicate a greater spatial overlap of egg deposition between these two species than suggested by previous research. Modifications and expansions to the current sampling protocol are being planned for the third year of this study, including the goal of reducing variance in egg densities among samples, standardizing the volume of consensed substrates retained from each quadrat bulk subsample, and evaluating alternative methods of separating eggs from substrate particles.

The Skagit River System Cooperative (SRSC) recently published initial results from its ongoing project Assessment of the Geomorphological and Ecological Consequences of Dike Breaching vs. Dike Removal for Estuarine Habitat Restoration in the journal Ecological Engineering (Volume 71, p.563-573). To provide insight into the relative benefit of dike breaching versus dike removal, tidal channel planform geometry was compared between historical dike breach sites and reference tidal marsh. Dike breach sites were found to have fewer tidal channel outlets than reference sites, but greater total channel surface area and length. These differences were likely the result of remnant dikes constraining tidal prism entirely to channel networks rather than allowing a portion of the prism to transit site boundaries as sheet flow. Allometric analysis of GIS-calculated tidal channel drainage basin area relative to total marsh area indicated the proportion of tidal prism comprised of sheet flow was inversely related to total marsh area, with the smallest marsh islands having no tidal channels and all of their tidal prism consisting of sheet flow. This suggests dike removal to restore sheetflow is most important for small restoration projects. However, dike removal may still be important for large restoration sites depending on issues not examined in their journal article, such as remnant dike effects on river flood hydrodynamics.

Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians is engaging in both marine and estuarine water quality monitoring through operation and maintenance of a marine buoy in Port Susan, surveys of harmful algal blooms (HABs), continued water collection for the Washington State BEACH program, and deployment of polar organic chemical integrative samplers (POCIS) to provide baseline data on the presence of emergent contaminants in critical estuarine habitat used by juvenile salmon. Monitoring for HABs is ongoing, the POCIS were deployed with data being analyzed at the USGS Columbia Lab, and the Port Susan buoy is operational with a link to Northwest Association of Networks Ocean Observing Systems (NANOOS) successfully established (<http://nvs.nanoos.org/Explorer>) and data uploaded to the site several times a week. This project represents the first time POCIS technology has been used in marine waters. The first season of this project served as a pilot to determine the best deployment method and time period for the POCIS. Deployment was successful with the exception of one site due to an unforeseen event of channel erosion following a high water event with a large volume of river water flushing into the distributary channel.

The Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe is engaging in the fourth year of their Hood Canal and Admiralty Inlet Nearshore Assessment project. Currently, the regional Lead Entity relies on a nearshore hypothesis described in the Hood Canal Coordinating Council Salmon Habitat Recovery Strategy (HCCC 2005) for prioritization and ranking of restoration and conservation actions within the marine nearshore environment. To investigate this hypothesis currently guiding salmon recovery within the nearshore habitats in Hood Canal and the Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca, the Tribe has been conducting surface trawling, hydroacoustic surveys, beach seining, and water quality monitoring. One of the most striking findings in the data thus far is that of the relative importance that small embayment's and spit formations play in providing rearing habitat for Juvenile salmonids within the mid and outer Hood Canal. This data will be utilized to re-evaluate nearshore restoration and habitat conservation efforts within the mid to outer portions of the Hood Canal.

(2) REFLECTION: We continue to enjoy and highly value our good working relationship with the EPA and our project officer. Continued and consistent funding for these high priority tribal projects is of the utmost importance to Puget Sound restoration and protection and we look forward to continuing to work with the EPA in current and future fiscal years in supporting our tribes and Puget Sound health.



